DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 205 TM 860 066

AUTHOR Ferguson, Harold L.; Enger, John M.
TITLE Missouri Performance Based Teacher Evaluation Program: Principal Perceived Ratings and Projected Job Targets.
PUB DATE May 85
NOTE 15p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Competence; Elementary Secondary Education; *Interrater Reliability; Job Performance; *Principals; Questionnaires; *Rating Scales; State Programs; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Competency Based Assessment; *Missouri Performance Based Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to: (1) assess the anticipated ratings of teacher performance by principals using the Missouri Performance Based Teacher Evaluation (PBTE) prior to the first cycle of its implementation; (2) determine whether or not elementary and secondary principals, using the same instrument, would be consistent in perceived ratings of their teachers on the nineteen criteria items of the PBTE; and (3) examine the projected number of job targets produced by these ratings. A questionnaire was sent to 19 randomly selected elementary and secondary school principals to estimate the percentage of their ratings of teacher performance for each of the 19 criteria on the PBTE rating scale. Thirty-five surveys were returned indicating similar ratings by both elementary and secondary school principals on each of the 19 criteria. Overall, 14.6 percent of all the perceived teacher ratings would produce job targets. Recommendations include the following criteria that should be met before a school district undertakes PBTE: (1) design a model to meet specific needs of the district; (2) have administrative support; (3) develop evaluators' skills; and (4) provide for ongoing staff inservice. (PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED265205

MISSOURI PERFORMANCE BASED TEACHER EVALUATION PROGRAM: PRINCIPAL PERCEIVED RATINGS AND PROJECTED JOB TARGETS

by

Harold L. Ferguson, Principal,
South Elementary School, Kennett, MO

and

John M. Enger, Associate Professor,
College of Education, Arkansas State University

May, 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ferguson, H.L.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

TM 860 066

MISSOURI PERFORMANCE BASED TEACHER EVALUATION PROGRAM:
PRINCIPAL PERCEIVED RATINGS AND PROJECTED JOB TARGETS

During the past decade there has been a movement throughout the United States to assess the competency of teachers. By 1983, thirty states had implemented some type of teacher evaluation program, twelve states reported serious discussions were being conducted to plan such a program, and only eight states reported no planned activities (Sandefur, 1983). Ten states had mandated performance based teacher evaluation either through their legislatures or state boards of education.

The most successful teacher evaluation programs are tailored to the district's instructional program (Stow and Sweeney, 1981), developed through participative planning of the school district's staff (Manatt, 1983), and provide for teacher development to improve their performance in the classroom (Pembroke and Goedert, 1982). The success of the teacher evaluation program is dependent on the development, too, of the evaluator's skills (Stow and Sweeney, 1981). To be effective, according to Brophy (1979), the teacher evaluator must be a connoisseur of good teaching.

Manatt (1983) found evaluators (generally the principals) had received little formal training in clinical supervision, the process which encompasses the planning,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

observation and evaluation of teacher performance. Yet, there is substantial evidence to illustrate that the principal's skills in these tasks contribute to effective schools (Edmonds and Fredrickson, 1979).

Missouri Performance Based Teacher Evaluation

Effective beginning the 1984-85 school year, the Missouri legislature mandated Performance Based Teacher Evaluation (PBTE). A twenty-four member steering committee then developed a model that could be used by the 549 school districts in the state. Valentine (1983) has provided a number of suggestions for school districts to consider in implementing the program.

The Missouri PBTE follows both formative and summative evaluation procedures. The formative evaluation procedures include: pre-observation conference, scheduled and unscheduled observations, post-observation conference, completion of the formative evaluation form, and construction of job targets in areas where teacher performance has been rated less than expected. The summative evaluation report is a composite of all information obtained during the formative phase and may serve as a basis for administrative decision making. Measures of teacher performance are reported on a four-point scale for each of nineteen specified criteria in four performance areas.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

One of the strengths of the Missouri PBTE process is the interaction between the teacher and the principal in the identification of specific, measurable behaviors which should result in improved performance in areas noted to be deficient. These job targets are key elements of a performance based system because they provide the direction for improving instruction with specific help suggestions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to: (1) assess the anticipated ratings of teacher performance by principals using the Missouri PBTE prior to the first cycle of its implementation; (2) determine whether or not elementary and secondary principals, using the same instrument, would be consistent in perceived ratings of their teachers on the nineteen criteria items of the Missouri PBTE; and (3) examine the projected number of job targets produced by these ratings.

Procedures

A questionnaire was developed in which principals were asked to estimate the percentages of their ratings of teacher performance for each of the nineteen criteria on the four-point Missouri PBTE rating scale (Markedly Less Than Expected, Sometimes Less Than Expected, Consistent With Expectations, and Markedly Above Expectations). Only AAA

schools in Supervisory Area D in Southeast Missouri were included in the survey. Nineteen randomly selected elementary principals and a similar number of secondary principals were asked to complete the survey in October, 1984. Collectively, they represented 1317 teachers in Supervisory Area D

Results

Of the 38 principals surveyed, 35 completed and returned the questionnaire on perceived teacher ratings using the Missouri PBTE nineteen-criteria instrument. This represents a 92 percent response rate. Collectively, these principals represented 1208 teachers in AAA schools in Supervisory Area D, also 92 percent.

As shown in Table 1, most of the ratings of teacher performance (76.6 percent) were perceived as being Consistent With Expectations. A total of 14.6 percent of the ratings were perceived as being less than expected, with 10.5 percent Sometimes Less Than Expected and 4.1 percent Markedly Less Than Expected. A composite of 8.8 percent of the ratings were perceived as being Markedly Above Expectations.

Insert Table 1 about here.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Although ratings on each of the nineteen criteria were similar, higher ratings were noted on Item 5 (demonstrates knowledge of subject matter) and Item 17 (follows the policies and procedures of the school district), and lower ratings were noted on Item 16 (participates in professional growth activities), Item 3 (provides for individual differences) and Item 8 (demonstrates ability to motivate students). Breakdowns between the four performance areas were also similar.

To test the consistencies between elementary and secondary principals' ratings of teacher performance, chi-square tests of independence were conducted at the .05 level of significance. In ten of the nineteen characteristics assessed, there was no significant relationship between the ratings given and level of instruction (elementary or secondary). The nine significant relationships produced contingency coefficients ranging from .08 to .17. Although significant because of the large number of teachers represented, these findings represent very weak relationships between projected teacher ratings and level of instruction. Thus, the instrument was noted to produce results consistent between the elementary and secondary levels.

For any teacher performance characteristic rated as less than expected (either Markedly Less Than Expected or Sometimes Less Than Expected) a job target has to be written

by the principal for the teacher. This job target is subsequently discussed, timelines are established, and the teacher performance is re-evaluated. Overall, 14.6 percent of the perceived teacher ratings would produce job targets.

The proportions of job targets for each of the nineteen characteristics assessed were contrasted using a z-test statistic at the .05 significance level. The ordered proportions of job targets for the nineteen characteristics are presented in Table 2. Fourteen characteristics did not produce proportions of job targets significantly different than the average, 14.6 percent.

Insert Table 2 about here.

Markedly higher proportions of job targets than the average were projected for three characteristics assessed: Item 16 (22.3 percent), participation in professional growth activities; Item 3 (19.5 percent), providing for individual differences; and Item 8 (17.6 percent), demonstrating the ability to motivate students. Two characteristics assessed were projected to produce significantly lower proportions of job targets than the average: Item 5 (6.7 percent), demonstrating knowledge of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

subject matter; and Item 7 (6.7 percent); following the policies and procedures of the school district.

Conclusions

The elementary and secondary principals were very consistent in their perceived ratings of teacher performance. For its purpose, this study may tend to validate the use of an identical instrument to evaluate teacher performance at both elementary and secondary levels of public education in Missouri.

The major purpose of the Missouri PBTE program is to identify, address and strengthen areas of teacher performance which are rated below expectations. For characteristics assessed as deficient (rated as Markedly Less Than Expected or Sometimes Less Than Expected), a job target is written for the teacher by the principal. Overall, 14.6 percent of all the perceived teacher ratings would produce job targets.

The vast amount of time required to properly address job targets by a typical principal would be difficult to manage. In assessing all teachers on the nineteen characteristics, a typical elementary principal in Southeast Missouri will average 88 job targets for teacher improvement while a typical secondary principal will address 111. Each job target requires another observation along with a post-observation conference. With observation

periods averaging 50 minutes and the post-observation conference another 30 minutes, follow up on job targets alone will add 73.3 hours to the role of elementary principals and 92.5 hours for secondary principals during the formative phase.[4]

In application it appears principals will not assign as many ratings which produce job targets as was perceived. Coupled with the many other responsibilities a principal assumes throughout the school day, this would be an enormous undertaking without a reduction of current and traditional job responsibilities.

Recommendations

From the review of the literature and findings of this investigation, it follows that certain criteria should be met before a school district undertakes PBTE. These criteria should include: (a) designing a model to meet the specific needs of the district; (b) administrative support; (c) a plan for development of evaluators' skills; and (d) provision for ongoing staff inservice. A developmental plan should also be followed for a successful transition to a performance based teacher evaluation. This plan should include a rigorous inservice training program for both teachers and administrators for understanding of identified tasks, events and responsibilities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Additionally, it is recommended that this study be replicated after a year or two of involvement in PBTE to contrast the perceived ratings with actual school use. Results from this study contrast could aid other educational institutions in determining needed inservice activities prior to program adoption. Results would also provide Missouri educators with information for identification of program elements possibly in need of revision.

As previously noted, three characteristics were projected to produce significantly more job targets than the average. Therefore, Missouri public schools should be encouraged to: (a) encourage teachers to participate in professional growth activities (Item 16), possibly through released time and/or financial inducements; (b) provide inservice for teachers on effective teaching strategies that provide for individual differences (Item 3); and (c) provide teachers with inservice programs to promote activities which have been demonstrated to be effective in motivating students (Item 8).

Finally, to be successful, the Missouri PBTE program must rely on a significant increase of the principal's time spent on teacher evaluation. With the day already filled with traditional responsibilities, release for these added time-consuming tasks will have to be addressed. The principal will also need to be trained in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

clinical supervision to effectively perform the evaluator's role in implementing the Missouri PBTE program.

References

Brophy, J. E. (1979, April). Using observation to improve your teaching. (Occasional Paper No. 21). East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.

Edmonds, R., & Fredrickson, J. (1979). Search for effective schools. Brooklyn, New York: Board of Education.

Manatt, R. P. (1983, January). Competent evaluators of teaching: Their knowledge, skills, attitudes. (Occasional Paper No. 83-1). Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University, The School Improvement Model Project.

Pembroke, E., & Goedert, E. R. (1982, December). What is the key to developing an effective teacher evaluation system? NASSP Bulletin, 66, 29-37.

Sandefur, J. T. (1983). Competency Assessment of Teachers: 1980-1983. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 238 858)

Stow, S. B., & Sweeney, J. (1981). A comprehensive three-year process for planning a system of accountability can ensure discriminating and valid results. Educational Leadership, 38, 539-541.

Valentine, J. W. (1983, September). Developing a performance based teacher evaluation system. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1

Percentage Responses for Principal Perceived

Ratings of Teacher Performance

Item Number	Characteristic Assessed	Markedly Less Than Expected	Sometime Less Than Expected	Consistent With Expectations	Markedly Above Expectations
1	Demonstrates appropriate preparation for classroom instruction	3.7	9.5	76.8	10.0
2	Implements a variety of effective teaching techniques	4.7	11.4	74.4	9.5
3	Provides for individual differences	6.6	12.9	69.7	10.8
4	Implements instructional objectives effectively	3.0	10.1	78.9	8.0
5	Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter	0.9	5.8	84.0	9.3
6	Uses a variety of teaching materials effectively	4.8	11.6	75.2	8.4
7	Uses instructional time effectively	5.1	11.5	75.5	7.9
8	Demonstrates ability to motivate students	4.5	13.1	72.9	9.5
9	Demonstrates ability to communicate effectively with students	3.5	11.3	77.2	8.0
10	Provides students with specific evaluative feedback	2.9	10.4	79.2	7.5
1-10	Average for Performance Area A: Instructional Process	4.0	10.7	76.4	8.9
11	Organizes classroom environment to promote learning	2.6	9.2	79.9	8.3
12	Manages tudent behavior in a constructive manner	4.3	10.2	77.2	8.3
11-12	Average Performance Area B: Classroom Management	3.5	9.7	78.6	8.2
13	Demonstrates positive interpersonnal relations	4.8	9.4	76.8	9.0
14	Demonstrates positive interpersonnal relations with educational staff	3.0	10.2	78.6	8.2
15	Demonstrates positive interpersonnal relations with parents/patrons	3.7	11.6	75.8	8.9
13-15	Average for Performance Area C:	3.8	10.4	77.1	8.7
16	Participates in professional growth activites	7.7	14.7	69.2	8.4
17	Follows the policies and procedures of the school district	1.6	5.1	85.9	7.4
18	Assumes responsibilities outside of the classroom as they relate to the school	4.9	11.3	72.4	11.4
19	Demonstrates a sense of professional responsibility	4.6	10.6	76.0	8.8
16-19	Average for Performance Area D: Professional Responsibilities	4.7	10.4	75.9	9.0
1-19	Overall Average Ratings	4.1	10.5	76.6	8.8

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Projected Proportions of Job Targets

for Characteristics Assessed

Percentage of Ratings Requiring Job Targets	Characteristic Assessed (Item Number)	Comments on Significant Contrasts
24		
23		
.	16	
22		
21		
20		Significantly more than the average number of job targets will be written for items 3,8,16.
.	3	
19		
18		
.	8	
17		
:	7	
:	6	
16 :	18	
:	2	
:	15	No significant difference from the average (14.6 percent) will be written for items 1,2,4,6,7,9,10, 11,12,13,14,15,18,19.
15 :	19	
:	9	
:	12	
14 :	13	
...	1,10,14	
13 :		
12		
.	11	
11		
10		
9		
8		
7		Significantly fewer than the average number of job targets will be written for items 5,17.
..	5,17	
6		
5		
4		
3		